Document 3021

Filed 05/16/25

Page 1 of 8

Case 3:23-md-03084-CRB

1	B.L. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No.
2	3:24-cv-7940
3	C.L. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:23-cv-04972
4	J.E. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No.
5	3:24-cv-03335
6	Jane Doe QLF 0001 v. Uber Technologies,
7	Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-08387-CRB
8	Jaylynn Dean v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:23-cv-06708
9	K.E. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No.
10	3:24-cv-05281-CRB
11	Amanda Lazio v. Uber Technologies, Inc., No. 3:24-cv-08937-CRB
12	3.24-CV-U0937-CRD
13	LCHB128 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-7019
14	T.L. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No.
15	3:24-cv-9217
16	WHB 318 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., No.
17	3:24-cv-04889
18	WHB 407 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05028
19	WHB 832 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., No.
20	3:24-cv-4900
21	WHB 1486 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04803
22	No. 5.24-cv-04803
23	WHB 1876 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05230
24	WHB 1898 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
25	No. 3:24-cv-05027
26	Jane Roe CL 68 v. Uber Technologies Inc., et
27	<i>al.</i> , No. 3:24-cv-06669

DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF SEALING CONFIDENTIAL MATERIALS

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 79-5(c) and (f)(3), Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Rasier, LLC, and Rasier-CA, LLC (collectively "Defendants" or "Uber"), respectfully submit this Administrative Motion to Seal Documents Attached as Exhibits to Motion to Transfer, contemporaneously filed with this motion on May 16, 2025 ("Defendants' Motion").

I. BACKGROUND AND REQUESTED SEALING

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

26

27

28

Defendants' Motion concerns Exhibits E-G and I-Q attached to the Motion to Transfer.¹ Defendants seek only to redact Plaintiffs' names from Checkbox Consent History exhibits for Plaintiffs who have filed anonymously pursuant to the Court's order finding that "the plaintiffs' need to proceed anonymously outweighs the prejudice to the defendants and the public's interest in knowing the parties' identities" and permitting anonymous filings. ECF 147, 174. Plaintiffs support this motion to seal Plaintiffs' names in these exhibits.

TTT THE THE STATE OF	support this interest to some remaining manager in these similarity.			
Document	Description	Designating Party		
Exhibit E: Checkbox Conse History (WHBE 1486)	nt Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber		
Exhibit F: Checkbox Conse History (WHB 1876)	nt Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber		
Exhibit G: Checkbox Conse History (LCHB128)	ent Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber		
Exhibit I: Checkbox Conser History (C.L.)	Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber		
Exhibit J: Checkbox Conser History (A.G.)	Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber		
Exhibit K: Checkbox Conse History (WHB 1898)	ent Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber		
Exhibit L: Checkbox Conse History (A.R.)	nt Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber		
I C		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

¹ Exhibit H is the Checkbox Consent History that was created for Plaintiff Jaylynn Dean, who has chosen not to proceed anonymously. Defendants are not seeking to redact her name.

Exhibit M: Checkbox Consent History (T.L.)	Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber
Exhibit N: Checkbox Consent History (WHB 407)	Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber
Exhibit O: Checkbox Consent History (WHB 318)	Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber
Exhibit P: Checkbox Consent History (WHB 832)	Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber
Exhibit Q: Checkbox Consent History (J.E.)	Redaction of Plaintiff's name	Uber

The Plaintiffs' names in Exhibits E-G and I-Q which are attached to Defendants' Motion to Transfer Venue should be maintained under seal for the same reasons that the Court previously found when it ordered that Plaintiffs may maintain their anonymity. [ECF 147, 174]. The Court has ruled that Plaintiffs have a privacy interest in maintaining anonymity in this suit, and there is no prejudice to the Plaintiffs or Defendants since they are already aware of the identities of the Plaintiffs. Defendants therefore submit this statement requesting that the Court seal under Local Rule 79-5(f)(3) for the reasons set forth below.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

Courts ruling on a request to seal information or documents must "conscientiously balance[] the competing interests of the public and the party who seeks to keep certain judicial records secret." *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2016). The presumption of public access is overcome where documents or information are the type "traditionally kept secret," *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006), such as "sources of business information that might harm a litigant's competitive standing." *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1097 (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978)).

Where the information or document to be sealed "is more than tangentially related to the underlying cause of action," courts apply the "compelling reasons" standard, and otherwise apply the lower "good cause" standard of Rule 26(c) in contexts where "[t]here is no tradition of public access" and "the public is not presumed to have a right of access to it." *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1097-99 (quoting *Anderson v. Cryovac, Inc.*, 805 F.2d 1, 13 (1st Cir.1986) and *Seattle Times*

Co. v. Rhinehart, 467 U.S. 20, 33 (1984)). Ultimately, "[w]hat constitutes a 'compelling reason' is 'best left to the sound discretion of the trial court." *Id.* at 1097.

Regardless of which standard applies here, a party may preserve his or her anonymity in a case "in special circumstances when the party's need for anonymity outweighs prejudice to the opposing party and the public's interest in knowing the party's identity" *Doe v. Revature, LLC*, 2022 WL 7631541, *2 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 13, 2022)—precisely the finding this Court has already made in allowing Plaintiffs to proceed anonymously [ECF 147, 174]. Courts will find that filing anonymously will not prejudice a defendant where a defendant already knows the identity of a plaintiff. *Doe v. Lee*, 2014 WL 630936, *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2014) (finding no prejudice where plaintiff initially filed her complaint under her true name in the public record and served the defendant with a copy of it, so he already knew her identity).

Courts often find "compelling reasons" exist to seal the names of plaintiffs in a court action where there is a strong privacy interest in protecting their identities. *F.R. by and through Litem v. Santa Clara Unified Sch. Dist.*, 2024 WL 3696482, *3 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2024) (sealing minor Plaintiff's name under compelling reasons standard); *Meyers v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.*, 2019 WL 120657, *2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2019) (sealing parties' filings that included name of Plaintiff's minor daughter). In addition, courts in this Circuit "routinely seal ... personal identifying information under the [more stringent] compelling reasons standard due to the potential privacy harm to the individual whose contact information may be exposed." *Jones v. PGA Tour, Inc.*, 2023 WL 7434197, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 5, 2023).

III. PLAINTIFFS' NAMES SHOULD BE KEPT UNDER SEAL

The redacted exhibits at issue are Checkbox Consent Histories, which are Uber documents documenting each Plaintiff's electronic consent to the terms of service. Defendants seek to redact only Plaintiffs' names in Exhibits E-G and I-Q, given their decision to proceed anonymously in this litigation. This Court has already ordered that Plaintiffs may proceed anonymously because their need to do so outweighs any prejudice to the defendants and the public's interest in knowing the parties' identities. [ECF 147, 174]. For the same reasoning, Defendants (with Plaintiffs' support) request that this Court allow Defendants' to redact Plaintiffs' names in Exhibits E-G and I-Q.

4

5

6 7

9

8

10 11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

A. There Are Compelling Reasons To Redact Plaintiffs' Names

The redactions to Exhibits E-G and I-Q are very narrow and are confined only to the names of the Plaintiffs.

Given the very limited legitimate public interest in disclosure of the names of the Plaintiffs in this case, these redactions should be maintained under seal under the "compelling reasons" standard. See, e.g., Revature, 2022 WL 7631541, at *2; Lee, 2014 WL 630936, at *2. Without these redactions, the Court's orders allowing these Plaintiffs to proceed anonymously [ECF 147, 174] would be rendered a nullity. Even aside from these orders, publicly disclosing Plaintiffs' names would allow their identities to be connected with every publicly available document regarding their case and this litigation. See F.R. by and through Litem, 2024 WL 3696482, *3; Meyers, 2019 WL 120657, *2.

В. **Less Restrictive Alternative to Sealing is Insufficient to Prevent Harm**

No less restrictive alternative to sealing the documents at issue is sufficient. The redactions to the Exhibits have already been very narrowly tailored so as to redact only the Plaintiffs' names, and neither party seeks to redact the exhibits in full. Actions short of sealing these portions of the Exhibits would not adequately protect Plaintiffs' privacy interests.

- 4 -

Document 3021 Filed 05/16/25 Page 8 of 8

Case 3:23-md-03084-CRB